

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/788,448	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUJINO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christopher RoDee	<b>Art Unit</b> 1756	

**All Participants:**

(1) Christopher RoDee.

(2) George Lesmes.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 20 October 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*2, 10, 11, 23, 24*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted counsel and noted that claims 10 and 11 have the same limitations as claims 23 and 24, respectively, and are not in conformance with 37 CFR 1.75c. Counsel and the Examiner agreed that claim 10 should be amended to be dependent on claim 2 to resolve this issue..